| | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| 5. | M/s Kalinga Open Cast Project (MCL) | Angul |
| 6. | M/s Bharatpur Project (MCL) | Angul |
| 7. | M/s Sukrangi Chromite Mines (M/s OMC Ltd.) | Jaipura |
| 8. | M/s Kaliapani Chromite Mines (M/s OMC Ltd.) | Jaipura |
| 9. | M/s South Kaliapani Chromite Mines (M/s OMC Ltd.) | Jaipura |
| 10. | M/s Kamarda Chromite Mines | Jaipura |
| 11. | M/sNALCO(CPP) | Angul |

**Protection of forest wealth in Northern India**

658. SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that wildlife population in South India has, of late, shown an increase, owing to measures undertaken by the Centre and State Government in the region;

(b) if so, the details of measures taken; and

(c) whether such measures to protect forest wealth would also be taken for Northern region?

THEMINISTEROFENVIRONMENT ANDFORESTS (SHRIT.R. BAALU): (a) to (c) The estimated population of tiger, leopard and elephant in four Southern States for two consecutive census is as follows:

| State | 1993 | | | 1997 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Tiger | Leopard | Elephant | Tiger | Leopard | Elephant |
| Andhra Pradesh | 197 | 152 | 46 | 171 | 138 | 57 |
| Karnataka | 305 | 455 | 5500 | 350 | 620 | 6088 |
| Kerala | 57 | 16 | 3500 | 73 | 16* | 5737 |
| Tamil Nadu | 97 | 138 | 2400 | 62 | 110 | 2971 |
| Total: | 656 | 761 | 1-1446 | 656 | 984 | 14853 |

NOTE: *Census not done. Hence the figure for 1993 incorporated in 1997 also)

The population are more or less on the same pattern as in other States of the country. Whereas tiger and leopard population has shown increase in some States there is decline in others. Howerver, there is a significant rise in the elephant pupulation of Southern States but selective killing of tuskers are reported from time to time. The Central and the State Governments have taken several initiatives for effective protection of wildlife but the success is limited because of increasing demand of ivory and parts and products from leopards and tigers in the clandestine market across the border. Central Government has been impressing upon State Governments the need to strengthen their wildlife conservation infrastructure. Financial assistance provided to the State Governments for this purpose during the last three years is as follows:

(Rs.in Lakhs)

| Sl. No | , Name of the Scheme | 1998-99 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Project Tiger Project Elephant | 1660.875 | 1749.162 | 1918.567 |
| 2. | Development of National Parks & | 547.01 | 596.57 | 636.85 |
| 3. | Sanctuaries | 934.883 | 1298.00 | 2479.984 |
| | TOTAL: | 3142.768 | 3643.732 | 5035.401 |

**Coastal Development**

659. SHRI R.S. GAVAI: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received complaints for the non-implementation of the guidelines for coastal development under Coastal Regulation Zone by State Governments;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) action proposed by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): (a) and (b)Yes, Sir. The Government has received complaints from various Non-Governmental Organisations and individuals regarding violation of Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification, 1991 in the coastal states of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Goa, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal.